

ROY BLUNT
MEMBER OF CONGRESS
7TH DISTRICT, MISSOURI

2229 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-6536
FAX: (202) 225-5604

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

COMMITTEE ON
ENERGY AND COMMERCE
DEPUTY RANKING MEMBER

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
COMMUNICATIONS, TECHNOLOGY,
AND THE INTERNET

HOUSE PERMANENT SELECT
COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

January 4, 2010

The Honorable Lisa Jackson
Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20460

Dear Administrator Jackson:

On December 7, 2009, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announced an endangerment finding regarding greenhouse gas emissions, which opens the door for the Administration to regulate these emissions under the Clean Air Act. In short, this finding would classify carbon emissions as an environmental hazard and give EPA sweeping authority to regulate it. These regulations could result in a host of new government burdens on small businesses, farms, and industry across our already fragile economy.

It is puzzling to me that on one hand, the Administration states that legislation is the proper way to address the regulation of greenhouse gas emissions, but on the other hand EPA is continuing down what appears to be a backdoor path to regulation. I'm very concerned that EPA, through this endangerment finding, has entered uncharted regulatory waters, circumventing the political process and coercing elected officials to enact a cap and trade program that has repeatedly failed to gain acceptance by the American people. When considering changes in public policy of this magnitude, Members of Congress must consider a broad range of questions regarding the policy's impact, not least of which is its impact on the economy and jobs in our communities. It is our expectation that federal agencies show the same respect to our constituents when considering new regulations.

On November 12, 2009 President Obama stated, "[W]e have an obligation to consider every additional, responsible step that we can to encourage and accelerate job creation in this country." It is my hope that the President shares my view that job creation is the most important public policy goal of 2010. But the Heritage Foundation recently found that in its first year a cap and trade program – such as that espoused by the Administration-supported Waxman-Markey bill – would cost 1.9 million jobs throughout the United States, including 32,225 jobs in my home state of Missouri. There is little evidence that these two Administration-supported policy goals – job creation and a cap and trade program – are compatible.

The Honorable Lisa Jackson

January 4, 2010

Page 2

Given this evidence, I request that you respond to the following critical questions:

- 1) What specific steps is the EPA taking to protect jobs as it implements this new rule?
- 2) What specific steps is the EPA taking to protect consumers and small businesses from large-scale electricity rate increases predicted to accompany its rule?
- 3) What specific steps is the EPA taking to protect farmers from spiraling cost increases resulting from the rule?
- 4) Would the EPA consider including a provision that would suspend the rule if electricity rates rise above a certain threshold (such as 20%), similar to an amendment I offered at the Energy & Commerce Committee?

I am concerned that proposed regulations by EPA will place a significant burden on our already struggling economy, including family farms and small businesses. We can find ways to protect our environment and our economy. Saving one at the expense of the other is not the proper course of action, but I believe the two are not mutually exclusive. Thank you for your attention and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincere regards,



Roy Blunt
Member of Congress